



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,881	04/25/2001	Jae Kyung Lee	P-219	4938
34610	7590	01/14/2005	EXAMINER	
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP P.O. BOX 221200 CHANTILLY, VA 20153			BELIVEAU, SCOTT E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/840,881	LEE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Scott Beliveau	2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they reference character “61” not mentioned in the description. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: S62, S63, S64 (Page 12, Lines 2-17). This objection may be overcome by either removing the “S” from the element numbers or adding an “S” to the labels of Figure 6. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid

abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 4 and 5 are objected to because the phrase “the product-related site server” lacks proper antecedent basis. For the purpose of art evaluation, it shall be presumed that the claims have been amended to read “a product-related site server” similar to the language of claim 3. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent

any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sturgeon et al. (US Pat No. 6,202,212) in view of Van Ryzin (US Pub No. 2002/0059241).

In consideration of claim 1, the Sturgeon et al. reference discloses an “apparatus” or network enabled “TV” [10] with an optical scanner that is operable to “reproduce video and audio signals by receiving a broadcast signal” comprising a “storing unit” [104/106/114/116/112] and a “controlling unit” [102]. The reference however, does not explicitly disclose nor preclude the usage of the PC functionality for the particular retrieval of product related information from the Internet.

The Van Ryzin reference discloses a technique whereby a PC is operable to “store proper information of a product” comprising a UPC or other equivalent code and “contact information of a certain site” [30 or that of the manufacturer] whereupon “function information and feature information of the product” associated with the on-line user manual are retrieved and displayed (Figure 3; Para. [0029] – [0034]). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to utilize the apparatus of Sturgeon et al. to apply the method of Van Ryzin for the purpose of advantageously providing a means for quickly linking to a desired web page for a user manual (Van Ryzin: Para. [0006].

Claim 2 is rejected wherein the “certain site is a product-related site” in so far as it, relates the product to the particular manufacture web-site or is the manufacturer of the product.

Claim 3 is rejected wherein the “function information and feature information of the product is provided from a product-related site server” associated with the manufacturer.

Claim 4 is rejected wherein the “controller unit transmits the proper information of the product to the product-related site server” [30] which subsequently performs the appropriate look-up function.

Claim 5 is rejected wherein the “proper information is contacted to the product-related site server” through a “network interface” [152].

Claim 6 is rejected wherein the “proper information of the product is a model name or model number” as a UPC serves as a model number assigned by the manufacturer (see Rothschild: Col 1, Lines 30-41 regarding the composition of a UPC).

In consideration of claim 7, the reference discloses that the server provides the “contact information” or Internet page address to the client which is subsequently utilized by the browser to link to the particular web page. The reference, however, does not explicitly state that the “contact information is a URL (Uniform Resource Locator)”. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a “URL” as a Internet page address since the examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE to the equivalence of a “URL” and “Internet page address” for their use in the Internet art as means for accessing a Internet page and the selection of any of these known equivalents to access a Internet web page through a browser would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

In consideration of claim 8, the “function information” is “information corresponding to video or audio-related functions” when the on-line user manual is related to audio/video equipment (Para. [0020]).

In consideration of claim 9, while the combined teachings disclose that the user is provided with on-line user guide corresponding to the requested product. The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that it is notoriously well known in the art for user manuals to comprise information detailing “special functions” associated with the particular device. For example, a special function corresponding to a PVR might be that corresponding to pause functionality. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to provide information in the user guide detailing “special functions” for the purpose advantageously explaining to the user the operation and functionality of the interconnected device.

8. Claims 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sturgeon et al. (US Pat No. 6,202,212) in view of Lee (US Pat No. 6,542,897).

In consideration of claim 10, as aforementioned, the Sturgeon et al. reference discloses an PC-“TV” [10] that facilitates a plurality of functional modes associated with a plurality of consumer electronic devices including modes that facilitate Internet access. While the reference suggests the particular usage of an on-line help manual, the reference does not explicitly disclose nor preclude the particular usage scenarios as claimed.

The Lee reference discloses a method for providing customer support improving upon traditional on-line manuals through the internet. The method comprises “transmitting proper information of a product to a certain site” [110], “receiving menu information corresponding

to the product" (Figure 13), "receiving information selected by a user in the menu information" (Figure 14), and "displaying the selected information on a screen" (Figure 15). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to utilize the Sturgeon et al. apparatus using the teachings of Lee for the purpose of providing an improved customer service system using the Internet to ensure a high level of customer satisfaction and minimize after-service cost for a computer system and other consumer electronics devices (Lee: Col 1, Line 48 – Col 2, Line 14).

Claim 11 is rejected wherein the "proper information is a model name or a model number of the product" (Lee: Col 5, Lines 11-22).

Claim 12 is rejected wherein the "proper information is transmitted by using contact information of the certain site" associated with the Internet based support server. For example, the user must utilize "contact information" in order to access the homepage of the support server [110].

In consideration of claim 13, the references do not explicitly disclose nor preclude that the "contact information is a URL (Universal Resource Locator)". The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that it is notoriously well known in the Internet art so as to utilize URLs in order to access Internet pages. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a "URL (Uniform Resource Locator)" as a means of "contact information" for the inherent advantages associated with such including the ability to utilize an easily remembered address name which further allows the customer service provider to advantageously change IP addresses, if necessary.

Claim 14 is rejected wherein the “certain site is a product-related site” by nature of it providing product related information.

Claim 15 is rejected wherein “the menu information is information corresponding to video or audio-related functions” (ex. CD-ROM Drive) and “information corresponding to a special function” such as those pertaining the support of a infra-red communication.

In consideration of claim 16, the Surgeon et al. reference discloses the existence usage of an “online help” button, however, it is silent as to details of it’s operation such that “contact information . . . [is] stored in advance”. As aforementioned, the Lee reference discloses the particular existence on-line help wherein the “contact information of the product-related site” is inherently “stored in advance” by the browser application prior to accessing the particular web site. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to modify the Surgeon et al. reference so as to particularly store the “contact information of the product-related site” in advance of the activation of the “Help button” for the purpose of providing the user with a simple means for accessing online help without requiring the user to have to manually enter the Internet page address each time access to help functionality is required.

Claim 17 is rejected wherein the “control method further comprises receiving and processing a broadcast signal when the function selection key signal is not inputted” (Figures 11-12).

In consideration of claim 18, the Lee reference discloses that the system initially displays a “general homepage information on a screen after receiving it when the proper information is not transmitted to the certain site” [300] (Lee: Col 5, Lines 1-11).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as follows. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objections made.

- The Call (US Pat No. 5,913,210) reference discloses an Internet system for delivering information about products from the manufacturer.
- The Rothschild (US Pat No. 6,430,554) reference discloses an interactive search system for utilizing bar codes to retrieve product information from the manufacturer.
- The Hayward et al. (US Pat No. 6,629,134) reference discloses a method of providing support to a user of a computer peripheral over the Internet using peripheral indicia such as model numbers.
- The Fischer et al. (US Pat No. 6,208,338) reference discloses an integrated online information system for requesting and receiving a documentation and/or help information.
- The Hirasawa et al. (US Pub No. 2003/0061196) reference illustrates user manual that is organized in a series of menus wherein the user may download a requested portion.
- The Mandyam et al. (US Pat No. 6,236,989) reference discloses a system and method for implementing a network-based help architecture.

- The Lortz (US Pat No. 6,505,243) reference discloses a method for providing device-specific help information using pre-stored address information.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Beliveau whose telephone number is 703-305-4907.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 a.m. - 6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 703-305-4795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SEB
January 8, 2005



JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600